

Appl. No. 10/606,319  
Amendment Dated 10/13/2006

Attorney Docket No.: DN 97-014 D1

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13 and 30 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13 and 30 are rejected.

Claims 13 and 30 are amended.

After entry of the amendment, claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13 and 30 remain pending.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written requirement. Examiner states that Applicant has amended the independent claims to a range of content of anti-block agent and has not pointed out where the Examiner may find support.

In response, Applicant submits that support for the range of content of antiblock agent, added to the independent claims 1 and 30 by previously filed amendment of April 28, 2006, "from about 0.1 percent to about 1.0 percent by weight of the antiblock agent" can be found on page 7, lines 1-6 in the Specification as originally filed. That portion of the Specification provides that:

A typical embodiment of the present invention could include:

From	To
about	about
0.1%	- 1.0% talc antiblock

Therefore the range of content of anti-block agent recited in the independent claims 1 and 30 is fully supported by the Specification as originally filed and thus no new matter has been added.

Applicant submits that independent claim 1, independent claim 30 and claims 3, 6, 7, 9 and 13 which depend from independent claim 1 comply with the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of this rejection is kindly requested.

Appl. No. 10/606,319  
Amendment Dated 10/13/2006

Attorney Docket No.: DN 97-014 D1

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by United States Patent No. 4,868,226 to Mitsuno et al. ("Mitsuno") for reasons of record since Examiner viewed Applicant's amendment of April 28, 2006 as new matter. For the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that the previously submitted amendment is fully supported by the Specification as originally filed and thus no new matter has been added.

Accordingly, Applicant repeats the arguments presented in the amendment filed on April 28, 2006 that Mitsuno fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13 and 30 and, as such, cannot anticipate these claims. Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of all pending claims are kindly requested.

### Amendments to Claims 13 and 30

Claims 13 and 30 are further amended to clarify the language without adding or deleting claim limitations. Thus, the amendments to claims 13 and 30 submitted herein are fully supported by the Specification as originally filed and no new matter is added.

### CONCLUSION

The amendments presented herein are fully supported by the disclosure as originally filed and no new matter has been added. Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application and allowance are requested.

Should Examiner not agree with Applicants' position, a telephone interview is respectfully requested to discuss any remaining issues and to expedite the eventual allowance of the application.

Appl. No. 10/606,319  
Amendment Dated 10/13/2006

Attorney Docket No.: DN 97-014 D1

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 13, 2006

G. H. Fairchild  
George H. Fairchild  
Reg. No. 56,347